

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 76-93 will remain pending in the present application. Claims 1-75 were previously cancelled. Claims 76-93 are subject to a nonstatutory double patenting rejection. Claims 76-93 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,988,095 (“Srinivasan”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,389,460 (“Stewart”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Fleurantin participated in a telephonic interview on February 21, 2007 to discuss the above claim amendments. Examiner Fleurantin stated that the above claim amendments more clearly described the claimed subject matter.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 76-93 are subject to a nonstatutory double patenting rejection over claims 1-8 of United States Patent No. 6,728,726. A terminal disclaimer is being filed herewith in connection with United States Patent No. 6,728,726. Accordingly, withdrawal of the nonstatutory double patenting rejection rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 85, 88 and 91 are objected to as being duplicates of claims 76, 79 and 82. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that claims 85, 88 and 91 recite a number of features that are not recited in claims 76, 79 and 82 such as, for example:

- using the structure context description to identify data corresponding to other attributes of the object;
- retrieving the data corresponding to all other attributes of the object;
- and
- placing in cache the data corresponding to other attributes of the object for future use

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 85, 88 and 91 are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 76-93 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,988,095 ("Srinivasan") in view of United States Patent No. 6,389,460 ("Stewart"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 76-84

Independent claims 76, 79 and 82 are directed to pre-fetching data for a particular attribute from all objects in an object set. For example, if an application submits a query requesting Attribute B of Object 4 (See Fig. 3), then data for Attribute B will be identified and retrieved from all objects in object set 310 (including Objects 3, 4, 5, and N). However, only Attribute B for Object 4 will be returned to the application. Attribute B for Objects 3, 5, and N will be placed in a cache for future use.

To reduce the time required to process the query, a "structure context description" that identifies each object in the set of objects is generated *prior to* receiving the query. Thus, when the query is received, the database can quickly and easily identify the related objects and pre-fetch the requested attribute from the related objects by simply referencing the pre-generated structure context description.

Srinivasan discloses that certain data may be pre-fetched from a database. However, Srinivasan discloses that objects are pre-fetched based on a pre-fetch path that is specified in the query itself (Srinivasan, Col. 7, ll. 51-62). Thus, because Srinivasan discloses that the query identifies which objects are to be pre-fetched, Srinivasan teaches away from generating a structure context description *prior to* receiving the query. Stewart similarly fails to teach or suggest generating a structure context description *prior to* receiving the query.

Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest "prior to receiving a query, creating a structure context description that identifies each object in the set of objects, whereby the structure context description reduces time required to process the query after the query is received," as recited in independent claims 76, 79 and 82. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent claims 76, 79 and 82 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 77, 78, 80, 81, 83 and 84 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

Claims 85-93

Independent claims 85, 88 and 91 are directed to pre-fetching data for *all* non-requested attributes in an object. For example, if an application submits a query requesting Attribute B of Object 4 (See Fig. 3), then data for *all* Attributes (including Attributes A, B, C, D and E) of Object 4 will be identified and retrieved. However, only Attribute B for Object 4 will be returned to the application. Attributes A, C, D and E will be placed in a cache for future use.

To reduce the time required to process the query, a "structure context description" that identifies each attribute in the object is generated *prior to* receiving the query. Thus, when the query is received, the database can quickly and easily identify each attribute in the object by simply referencing the pre-generated structure context description.

Srinivasan discloses that certain data may be pre-fetched from a database. However, Srinivasan discloses that objects are pre-fetched based on a pre-fetch path that is specified in the query itself (Srinivasan, Col. 7, ll. 51-62). Thus, because Srinivasan discloses that the query identifies which objects are to be pre-fetched, Srinivasan teaches away from generating a structure context description *prior to* receiving the query. Stewart similarly fails to teach or suggest generating a structure context description *prior to* receiving the query.

Additionally, Srinivasan discloses that only "base level" attributes (rather than all attributes) are retrieved for each object (Srinivasan, Col. 6, ll. 29-32 and 57-60). Thus, Srinivasan teaches away from retrieving all attributes for an object. Stewart similarly fails to teach or suggest retrieving all attributes for an object.

Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest "prior to receiving a query, creating a structure context description that identifies each attribute in the object, whereby the structure context description reduces time required to process the query after the query is received," as recited in independent claims 85, 88 and 91. Additionally, the cited references do not teach or suggest "retrieving the data corresponding to all other attributes of the object," as recited in independent claims 85, 88 and 91. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit

DOCKET NO.: 115152.2 / MSFT-2911
Application No.: 10/782,229
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

that independent claims 85, 88 and 91 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 86, 87, 89, 90, 92 and 93 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 115152.2 / MSFT-2911
Application No.: 10/782,229
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the above amendments. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: March 26, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439